Exhibit 9

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1097-9 Filed 08/07/17 Page 2 of 6 WAYMO & UBER CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
4	000
5	
6	WAYMO LLC,
7	Plaintiff,
8	vs. No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA
9	UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;
	OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING,
10	INC.,
11	Defendants.
	/
12	
13	WAYMO & UBER CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
14	
15	VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF CAMERON POETZSCHER
16	SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
17	MONDAY, JUNE 19, 2017
18	
19	
20	BY: ANDREA M. IGNACIO,
21	CSR, RPR, CRR, CCRR, CLR
22	CSR LICENSE NO. 9830
23	JOB NO. 2642012
24	
25	Pages 1 - 374
	Page 1

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1097-9 Filed 08/07/17 Page 3 of 6 WAYMO & UBER CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1		15:44
2		15:44
3	You know, for any number of reasons; right?	15:44
4	If we didn't like the terms or conditions, we wouldn't	15:44
5	have signed, same as any other deal.	15:44
6	Q The term sheet was signed on February 22nd,	15:44
7	2016, and the acquisition agreement was signed on	15:45
8	April 11th, 2016.	15:45
9	When did Uber decide that it was going to go	15:45
10	ahead with the transaction?	15:45
11	A I mean, on or about April 11th we got final	15:45
12	board approval. Obviously, we didn't do all this work	15:45
13	and make a last-minute, you know, flippant decision.	15:45
14	But clearly, we made a final decision on or about	15:45
15	April 11th. We got board approval, and we signed the	15:45
16	transaction.	15:45
17	Q How long did it take to get board approval?	15:45
18	A I mean, we had a board meeting. We had a	15:45
19	discussion at the with the board. I can't recall	15:45
20	how long it was. It was a serious discussion. And	15:45
21	then after that, we signed. I don't remember the	15:45
22	exact day of the board meeting, whether it's the same	15:45
23	day or previously.	15:45
24	Q Did you attend that board meeting?	15 : 45
25	A Yes.	15 : 45
	Pag	ge 296

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1097-9 Filed 08/07/17 Page 4 of 6 WAYMO & UBER CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	Q Who else was there?	15:45
2	A The members of the Board of Directors. I	15:45
3	don't recall exactly who was there.	15:45
4	Q Were all of the members of the Board of	15:45
5	Directors there?	15:45
6	A I don't recall.	15:45
7	Q Do you recall any missing?	15:45
8	A I recall there were some on the phone, so	15 : 45
9	there were definitely some who weren't in the room. I	15:45
10	don't know if between phone and room, there were still	15:46
11	some who were not in attendance at all. I don't know.	15 : 46
12	Q Were there any discussions about whether	15:46
13	whether the acquisition should be brought to the	15:46
14	entire board versus only a portion of the board?	15:46
15	A I believe it was brought to a regular board	15:46
16	meeting where all of the board members were invited.	15:46
17	Whether they all attended, again, I can't recall.	15:46
18	Q But, as far as you know, all of the board	15:46
19	members were invited to that meeting?	15:46
20	A As far as I know. The only caveat I would	15:46
21	say is that I don't recall whether, who	15:46
22	was a Google executive, was still a member of the	15:46
23	board. So, to the extent he was, I'm sure we would	15:46
24	have not invited him or had him recuse himself.	15:46
25	Obviously, we had great concerns about having	15:46
	Рас	ge 297

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1097-9 Filed 08/07/17 Page 5 of 6 WAYMO & UBER CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	a Google senior Google executive on our Board of	15:46
2	Directors.	15:46
3	Q Were there board meetings discussing the	15:46
4	acquisition of Otto, or NewCo before it became Otto,	15:47
5	prior to the one getting approval to go through with	15:47
6	the agreement?	15:47
7	A I don't recall for sure. I do believe we had	15:47
8	some discussions with the board in advance. I don't	15:47
9	believe they were suddenly notified of this deal and	15:47
10	approved it immediately on the same day. I think	15:47
11	there was some lead-up.	15:47
12	Q And was included on that	15:47
13	included in those discussions?	15:47
14	A Not that I recall. And I doubt he would have	15:47
15	been, if he were even on the board at that time,	15:47
16	again.	15:47
17	Q Do you know if was	15:47
18	specifically asked to recuse himself from board	15:47
19	meetings discussing this potential acquisition?	15:47
20	A I don't know. You'd have to ask our general	15:47
21	counsel or someone else who deals with board	15:47
22	practices.	15:47
23	Q Before we start talking about Exhibit 81, I'm	15:48
24	going to hand you the other pieces of the document I	15:48
25	previously gave you.	15:48
	Pa	ge 298

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 1097-9 Filed 08/07/17 Page 6 of 6 WAYMO & UBER CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	JURAT
2	
3	I, Cameron Poetzscher, do hereby certify
4	under penalty of perjury, that I have read the
5	foregoing transcript of my deposition in the matter of
6	Waymo LLC vs. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., taken
7	on June 19, 2017, that I have made such corrections as
8	appear noted herein in ink, initialed by me; that my
9	testimony as contained herein, as corrected, is true
10	and correct.
11	
12	
13	DATED this, 2017,
14	at
15	
16	
17	
18	SIGNATURE OF WITNESS
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	Page 373